

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 5-7 and 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,243,142 to Ishikawa et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,903 to Nakatani et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,439 to Kambe et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 5 to differently define the invention in response to the Office Action dated November 17, 2006. Accordingly, claims 5-7 and 10-17 remain pending in this application for further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-7 and 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al. in view of Nakatani et al. and further in view of Kambe et al. To the extent that the rejection might be applied against the claims as newly-amended, it is respectfully traversed as being based on a reference or a combination of references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in the claims.

With regard to independent claim 5, as newly-amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishikawa et al., Nakatani et al. and Kambe et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least the recited feature of “wherein the dicyandiamide curing agent is used to reduce deterioration in adhesive strength between the solvent-free insulative filling material and the conductor layer.” This

feature is fully supported by at least disclosure in line 25 of page 6 to line 9 of page 7 in the specification.

As conceded by the Office Action, Ishikawa et al. fails to teach or suggest the ingredients, including the claimed “dicyandiamide curing agent,” of the non-conductive paste layer. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishikawa et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of “wherein the dicyandiamide curing agent is used to reduce deterioration in adhesive strength between the solvent-free insulative filling material and the conductor layer,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5.

Further, Nakatani et al. does disclose the dicyandiamide. However, in contrast to the present invention of newly-amended independent claim 5, Nakatani et al. is completely silent about whether the dicyandiamide could be used to reduce deterioration in adhesive strength between a solvent-free insulative filling material and a conductor layer. Moreover, Nakatani et al. merely discloses conductive paste but fails to teach or suggest any non-conductive filling material. In other works, Applicants respectfully submit that Nakatani et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of “wherein the dicyandiamide curing agent is used to reduce deterioration in adhesive strength between the solvent-free insulative filling material and the conductor layer,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5.

Furthermore, the Office Action does not rely upon Kambe et al. to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Ishikawa et al. and Nakatani et al. Applicants respectfully submit that Kambe et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Ishikawa et al. and Nakatani et al. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that Kambe et al. also fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of “wherein the dicyandiamide curing agent is used to reduce deterioration in adhesive

strength between the solvent-free insulative filling material and the conductor layer,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishikawa et al., Nakatani et al. and Kambe et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination, including at least the recited feature of “wherein the dicyandiamide curing agent is used to reduce deterioration in adhesive strength between the solvent-free insulative filling material and the conductor layer,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 5 of the present application.

For at least the reasons as those set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to newly-amended independent claim 5, and hence its dependent claims 6-7 and 10-17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Without other rejections pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5-7 and 10-17 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP

By: _____

Xiaobin You
Reg. No. L0112

Dated: January 3, 2007

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Tel 202.739.3000
Fax 202.739.3001